

22. (Withdrawn) The computer data signal of claim 18 wherein the program code for configuring a component of an application sharing program is responsive to the selected user preference, the monitored feedback and the selected administrator preference.

#### REMARKS

Claims 10 – 14 and 18 – 22 remain withdrawn. Claims 1 and 15 have been amended. Claims 1 – 9 and 15 - 17 are pending in this Application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

#### Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1 – 5, 9, 15, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Popa (US Patent no. 6,006,231). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Applicants' independent claims 1 and 15 have been amended as suggested by the Examiner in the Office Action of November 8, 2007. Exemplary claim 1 as amended claims a method for configuring and dynamically adapting an application sharing system. The method comprises the steps of determining a preference for the shared application; monitoring a feedback generated by the one of the system components; and configuring one of the system components in response to the determined preference and the monitored feedback. Claim 15 similarly recites feedback generated by one of the software components.

In contrast, Popa fails to teach or suggest a method including the claimed steps of “monitoring a feedback generated by the one of the system components; and configuring one of the system components in response to the determined preference and the monitored feedback”. The Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 1 and its dependent claims 2 – 5 and 9 are now in condition for allowance. Independent Claim 15 contains limitations similar to those of Claim 1.

Therefore, the Applicants respectfully assert that claims 15 and 16 are also in condition for allowance.

#### Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 6 – 8 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Popa in view of Boston et al. (Publication no. US 2004/0101272A1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 6 – 8 depend on Claim 1. Claim 17 depends on Claim 15. Popa fails to teach or suggest the claimed feedback requirements of Claims 1 and 15. Boston adds nothing further to solve the deficiencies of Popa. Thus Popa and Boston, taken together or in part, fail to teach or suggest the applicant's claimed invention as set forth in claims 1 – 9 and 15 – 17. The Applicants therefore respectfully assert that claims 1 – 9 and 15 – 17 are in condition for allowance.

#### CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and arguments made herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance and request early favorable action by the Examiner.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conversation with the Applicants' representative would expedite allowance of this application, the Examiner is cordially invited to call the undersigned at (508) 303-2003.

Date: February 7, 2008

Reg. No.: 37,946

Fax No.: (508) 303-0005

Tel. No.: (508) 303-2003

Respectfully submitted,

/Mary M. Steubing/

Mary M. Steubing

Attorney for Applicants

Guerin & Rodriguez, LLP

5 Mount Royal Avenue

Marlborough, MA 01752